

THE DEMOCRAT.

CANTON, MISS.

SATURDAY, NOVEMBER 19, 1842.

FOR PRESIDENT,

JOHN C. CALHOUN,

OF SOUTH CAROLINA,

[Subject to the decision of a National Convention.]

"Nor is our Government to be maintained, or our Union preserved by invasions of the rights and powers of the several States. In this attempt to make our General Government strong, we make it weak. Its true strength consists in leaving individuals and States, as much as possible, to themselves—in making itself felt, not in its power, but in its beneficence, not in its control, but in its protection, not in binding the States more closely to the centre, but leaving each to move unobstructed in its proper orbit."—Jackson.

THE VETO POWER.

Mr. Clay said, at Indianapolis, that the Democratic party gloried in the veto power. Right; we do glory in it, because we believe it to be a wise and conservative principle of our government, without which the liberties of the country and especially the rights and interests of the Southern minority would be greatly jeopardized; because it has served to protect those rights and interests, and to maintain the greater purity of the Constitution; because it is a part of the Constitution, engrained there in times of calm and patriotic legislation, by wiser heads, and as pure hearts as ours; and because we believe it to be the solemn and sacred duty of the citizen to maintain the Constitution and carry out all its provisions until they are amended, (if amendments are necessary,) in the proper way. So long as we pretend to live under a government of a written constitution we shall glory in adhering to all its forms, limitations and restrictions; we will preach obedience to the will of majorities ascertained according to all the forms of that constitution, and to no other. We are entirely opposed to the constitution's being in theory one thing, and in practice another. As it stands, it is not in the way of any democratic measures, but the rather sustains, guards and protects them. It has, on the contrary, ever been the great obstacle in the way of the Whigs in accomplishing their designs; therefore they assail it, first, by false construction, then with attempts set up in the place of the real constitution itself, the false and federal interpretations of courts, and, lastly, by proposing amendments to the instrument, in relation to the veto power, which are aimed against the very principle of constitutional government—the principle of protection to the rights of minorities, by constitutional restraints and safeguards.

To accomplish his policy, Mr. Clay seems to intend, in one of these ways, to trample the constitution under foot, "with a sacrilege only less odious than that of the mercenary traders of Japan who are compelled to tread under foot the cross of the Redeemer."

But fortunately for the whole country, and especially for the slave interests of the South, Mr. Clay's proposition to repeal the veto power and to introduce faction, licentiousness and the tyranny of "King numbers" in the place of the just restraints of constitutional liberty, does not meet with the approbation of any very considerable majority of even his own political party. It is strange that a political heresy so flagrant should have been countenanced by anyone of any party. The principle upon which Mr. Clay himself opposes the veto power—the principle of implicit obedience to the will of numerical majorities—is in itself itself federal; it is incompatible with any other notions than that the people of the United States form one consolidated government, in which all the rights "of the States respectively" are merged; a heresy which Mr. Clay would be ashamed to avow, though his principle of obedience to bare numerical majorities is incompatible with any other hypothesis. And, if ours were a consolidated government of the people, in which all State sovereignty was merged in one general head, even then the doctrine of numerical majorities would be, in its nature and tendency, unjust, oppressive and tyrannical. This may be illustrated in the following way: Suppose five men to unite in a mercantile partnership, for their common good. Of these, four constitute the greatest majority. Apply the principle of numerical majorities to this small community of persons, and it will be seen that a majority of four, or even the smallest majority of three, could control the whole operations of the partnership as they might please. They might, if they chose, divide amongst themselves the whole profits, and give nothing to the minority. To prevent this, the parties would make an express contract between themselves, limiting the will of the majority, and protecting the rights of all, or in the absence of any express contract, the general law of the land would protect the property and rights of each and all. So in governments, or political partnerships, formed for the general good, as there can be no general law, which controls and restrains the power of the majority, so as to protect the rights of minorities, the experience of ages has demonstrated the necessity of forming, for that purpose, a written contract of union and political partnership—a constitution. Without such written constitution the minority would, in governments, as necessarily be exposed to the tyranny of the majority, as in the case put of common mercantile partnership. As in the mercantile partnership we have seen that the unrestrained majority might take all the profits to themselves, so in the political partnership, the numerical majority might perpetrate equal injustice and oppression; it might, for instance, levy high taxes exclusively upon the minority, and appropriate all the money arising thereby, to the benefit of the majority—something which is proposed to be done by the American System of Mr. Clay!

Mr. Clay's principle of the power of popular numbers is opposed to the reason, the theory, the design of the constitution. It, in fact, strikes at the very foundation and object of the constitution. Constitutional government and Mr. Clay's principle cannot exist together; for the constitutional compact must be superior to the mere phrenzy of popular majorities, or it must yield thereto and cease to exist. As well might a bare majority in the case of common partnership, vote away their contract with, and to trample on the rights of the minority, as a simple numerical political majority to over-reach the constitution and destroy the rights and liberties of the lesser number.

The democratic party is as much attached as is Mr. Clay or any of his friends, to the principle of majorities. We desire to act in conformity to the will of the people as expressed in the constitution. We know that that instrument was framed in a spirit of conciliation and compromise; that its glorious benefits would never have been bequeathed to us, if it had not secured the rights of all, those of the minority as well as of the majority—by checks and balances of which the veto power is the best and most important. The framers of the constitution, preferred its qualified veto, to the tyranny and despotism of legislative majorities, and so do we the present true supporters of that instrument. We think on this subject as did our great political exemplar, Mr. Jefferson, who (in his notes on Virginia, p. 214) said:

"An elective despotism (a mere legislative power) was not the government we fought for; but one which should not only be founded on free principles, but in which the powers of government should be so divided and balanced among several bodies of magistracy, as that no one could transcend their legal limits without being effectually checked and restrained by the others."

THE CONVENTION OF PLANTERS. It will be remembered that this Convention will meet at this place, on SATURDAY NEXT, the 26th of November.

MR. CLAY—HIS CONSISTENCY. Mr. Clay never makes a speech nowadays, in which he does not talk long and loud against the "one man power," as demagogues and claptrap politicians are wont to call the veto power as contained in the Constitution. He insisted, in his speech, recently made at Indianapolis, that such power was "rank nullification," that if the majority of the people wills the establishment of certain measures, that will should be consulted, &c.

How long has Mr. Clay entertained these opinions? Certainly this zealous attachment, on his part, to the will of majorities, is something new born, else in his practice on this subject he will be found, on examination, to differ widely from his professions and precepts. Not to mention other instances of less magnitude, it will be remembered by all, with what sovereign contempt he treated the will of the majority in the Presidential election of 1824. Gen. Jackson, in that election, received a large majority of electoral votes, and also, a majority over any other candidate, of the popular votes of the Union. The people of Kentucky almost unanimously preferred Gen. Jackson to Mr. Adams, and Mr. Legislature instructed Mr. Clay, then a member of Congress, to vote for the former. It is plain, how Mr. Clay, under these circumstances, and upon his now vaunted principles of obedience to the will of majorities, should have acted. But how did he act? Alas! the world knows by heart. He treated with contempt, the will of the people of Kentucky, and the instructions of her Legislature; he disregarded the large majority of electoral and popular votes that had been cast for Gen. Jackson, and, setting up in opposition, his own "one man power," he acted in fixing upon the country, for four years, the federal administration of John Q. Adams, against the will of a majority of the people, and under such circumstances as ever have and will carry with them the suspicion, at least, not only of political but moral turpitude.

Mr. T. F. Marshall, is canvassing the State of Kentucky, making speeches against Mr. Clay and arguing against the repeal of the veto power. Lay on McDuff.

MR. CALHOUN.—The South Carolina papers contradict the rumor that has been in circulation, of the intended resignation, by Mr. Calhoun, of his seat in the Senate.

The Democrats held a meeting in Jackson on Monday last, at which resolutions were passed which we publish to-day in another column. The resolutions speak for themselves, and so far as they go, they embody the true Democratic States rights faith. We are glad to see that the Democratic party in this State is beginning to speak out, in primary assemblies, as in former days, against the protective tariff. If the South does not stand up boldly in defence of her rights, she may not expect to retain them long. The resolutions show, that let our Whig brethren of the South, many of whom have heretofore joined heart and hand with us, on this Tariff question, do as they please, we are disposed to stand by the South, for our interests, and our true honored principles on this subject.

We have but two objections to make to the proceedings, viz: We do not like the recommendation that the State Convention be held at Jackson. There is an impression amongst many that a clique at that place has an undue control of matters on such occasions. The northern portion of the State object seriously to Jackson for this reason, as well as because it increases the difficulty of their attendance who have not the same facilities for traveling that a large portion of South Mississippi has. For these reasons, amongst others that might be urged, we think it altogether proper, in order to remove all dissensions on this subject, that the place of holding the convention should be changed, to this place, or to some place not far north of this. There are many reasons why Canton should be the place of meeting. It is within twenty five miles of the centre of the State, the public accommodations here are large and good, and our brethren would be glad of the opportunity to welcome their fellow Democrats at their private boards and family firesides. The facilities for getting here are greater to the greater number, than to any other place in the State. There is a regular stage line from Jackson to this place, and also, one from Columbus through Louisville and Haysville, and another from Holly Springs through Oxford, Carrollton, Lexington, Benton, &c. which meet here. To our friends east of Pearl river this place would probably be more accessible than Jackson; certainly not less so. We hope that the various presses in the State will speak out their sentiments on this subject.

Our other objection to the resolutions is that they do not express the preference, which we know a vast majority of the persons composing the meeting entertain, for Mr. Calhoun, as the nominee of our party for the Presidency. It is too late in the day to be doing and avoiding this expression of feeling and opinion. The South will, in our opinion, be bound by every consideration of gratitude, of justice and of principle, sooner or later to speak out in preference of her distinguished son and champion, and we quicker and more cheerfully it is done, the less state the will be. By his election once we shall accomplish in one man, what we have for our race and our principles, than by successive upon successes, with any other man as our candidate. The northern Democrats see and acknowledge this; and shall we of the South, be behind them in the advancement of Mr. Calhoun?

TEXAS.—The Relief Bill has been defeated in the Senate by a vote of 15 to 10. The Legislature was to have adjourned on 14th inst.

The Bill to examine into the condition of the State Bank and Branches was rejected in the House. It is expected that the banks there will discount to an amount sufficient to meet the value of the present crop.

Imprisonment for debt in the State, has been fully abolished.

The corporation elections in Mobile have gone for the Whigs by an average majority of about 300 votes.

Mr. John C. Spencer, Secretary of War, in a letter recently written to a New York committee has stated that just previous to the veto of the second bank bill, the President submitted to his then cabinet whether he should in his message then about to be transmitted to Congress, announce his determination not to be a candidate for re-election; and that against his doing so, all the members of his then cabinet, then present, protested, alleging amongst other reasons, that he had not been elected President, and no obligation rested upon him to decline. So, too, stated Mr. Cushing in his recent speech at Newburyport and Lowell, and Mr. Wise in his letter to his constituents. Yet Messrs. Bell, Granger, Ewing, et al. come now, charge Mr. Tyler with being actuated in his bank vetoes, by ambitious and selfish views.

Many of the Whig papers in the State, have published Mr. Clay's speech recently made at Indianapolis. We are glad of this. We are anxious that the South should be put in possession of the latest exposition of Mr. Clay's political views, that our Whig brethren may know the full they have to swallow, if they take Mr. Clay, and the degree of nausea and vomiting it will be likely to occasion. With this view, we should, probably, have published said speech ourselves, but as our neighbor has published it, we shall not do so, but will content ourselves with calling the attention of our readers to it. It will be found to be federal in almost every thing going in for Internal Improvements, Protective Tariffs, Distribution Banks, &c.

Mr. C. says he and his party are in favor of a National Bank only, but of STATE BANKS! Whom will the Whigs hereabouts, who abuse State Banks, and pretend that they are Democratic measures think of this!

Mr. C. in this speech, again advocates the repeal of the Constitution with respect to the veto power. He says it is "rank nullification"—as rank as the nullification of South Carolina, which crushed the laws of Congress, and bad defiance to the nation's will." And how will some of our nullifying Whig friends relish that!

He praises the present protective tariff law, and says, "I should, if in Congress, have supported the bill." He claims it as a Whig measure, and abuses the Democrats for having given for the bill, only nineteen, out of their eighty votes in the House, and only four for it in the Senate, two of which, (Mr. Buchanan's and Mr. Wright's) he says were "reluctant." Some of the Whig presses in this State have been assiduous in their endeavors to cast the blame of the present tariff upon our party, and to this end, they have published the letter of a certain Mr. Read, of Pa. They will probably now conclude that Mr. Clay's testimony on the subject is the best, and, as he has given the nod, they will now claim for the Whigs, the exclusive paternity of the tariff, and like Mr. Clay, praise it as a measure not "less necessary for revenue than for protection."

It will be seen, by reference to the proceedings published to-day, that at a Democratic meeting held in Jackson on Monday last, it was recommended that meetings be held in the several counties of this State for the purpose of conferring together on the subject of the Democratic nomination of candidates for the next Presidency and Vice Presidency and for State offices, also for the appointment of delegates to meet in general convention on 22d day of February next.

We have consulted with many of our Democratic friends on the subject who unite with us in recommending MONDAY THE SECOND DAY OF JANUARY NEXT as the most suitable time for holding a county meeting, at this place.

The number of petitioners in Kentucky, for the benefit of the bankrupt law, was, up to the 25th Oct. last, 1,416.

The Legislature of Vermont has, by a unanimous vote, instructed her members of Congress to vote for the repeal of the Bankrupt Law.

Hon. Samuel C. Crafts has been elected United States Senator for Vermont, for the next six years, in place of the Hon. Mr. Prentiss, resigned.

The Democrats held a meeting on the 5th inst., at Pontotoc, in this State, at which the Tariff was denounced, and a series of strong democratic resolutions were passed.

The National Intelligencer publishes an extract from a letter from Senator Woodbridge of Michigan, which shows that the Hon. Senator is "not dead but liveth." He has been very ill, but is not dead, as we and many of our editorial brethren have published to the world.

The Mississippi Creole seems to think that we Democratic party "sustain the one man power against the majority." But it is not the fact that our party sustains the "one man power" against the majority. We have, it is true, defended the exercise of the veto power when directed against Congressional majorities, but history shows that the use of the power by us was always in consonance with, in-tend of being against the popular majority. Witness, for instance, Gen. Jackson's veto of the Bank Bill, and his re-election, immediately afterwards, by an increased and overwhelming majority of the people—the bank question, being distinctly made the issue, and being brought forward, by Mr. Webster, prematurely, for the avowed purpose of defeating Gen. Jackson's re-election, by arraying against him its supposed but mis-applied popularity.

The Democratic party do, also, sustain the votes of President Tyler on the

riff and Bank bills; but in doing so, do they sustain the "one man power" against the majority? No; these vetoes were hurled against Congressional majorities, but not against a majority of the people. To prove this fully we have only to submit the following calculations extracted from a recent communication in the Globe signed "Justice." Mr. Clay said at Indianapolis, that the present Congress are the true exponents of the will of the nation on the Bank and Tariff questions. Supposing Mr. Clay and his friends to be right in this, the following extracts show that "presuming (as the author says) every single member of Congress to represent his constituents with fidelity, there have not been enough Whig votes given in Congress in favor of a single Whig measure, to represent a majority of the people."

Here are the extracts—read them: "The total majority of the popular vote for General Harrison in 1840, was 143,407; and this is exclusive of South Carolina, whose electors were chosen by her Legislature; and who, being almost exclusively Democratic, would have thrown almost her entire vote against General Harrison, and thereby reduced very materially his majority. Harrison's majority, furthermore, was much larger than was received by the Whig members of Congress over their opponents. In some of the States it was twice as large. But let that pass; and let us take Harris's majority as the true criterion of the popular strength of the Whig party."

"The popular vote for President in 1840 was 2,402,741. The total number of Representatives in Congress was 242; so that the average number of voters represented by a member was almost exactly 10,000. Now, then, the Whigs, with a majority of 143,407 votes, would be entitled to a little more than 14 of a majority in the House of Representatives; and yet in that body their majority (exclusive of South Carolina) was 55 1/2 or 41 more than their popular vote entitled them to have."

Now let us consider the consequences of this enormously disproportionate representative power. The greatest master of Whig strength in Congress, the highest vote given by them in that body, was on their great sine qua non, the bank bill, on the 6th August, 1841, in the extra session. Their majority was 31 only, or ten votes less than the excess of their representative over their popular power. Seventeen Whig members refused to vote for that bill; and these seventeen represent 170,000 voters, which far exceeds the majority of General Harrison, even leaving South Carolina out of the calculation. It is thus proven conclusively, demonstratively, after allowing the Whigs the highest majority they can claim, and making no deduction for South Carolina, that the members of Congress who voted for the bank bill represented a constituency that wanted nearly 30,000 votes of being a majority of the people."

But Mr. Clay tells us that Congress represents the will of the people; and, undoubtedly, the Congressional election of 1840 is a more correct criterion of the strength of parties than the Presidential; for the contest for Congress came first, and having shown which was the weaker party, left that party no motive to rally for the President. Accordingly, in Ohio, the aggregate majority for the Whig Congressmen was only 12,075, or about half of the Whig President's majority; although the aggregate votes at both elections were not 4,000 different. I have not the returns of other Congressional elections before me; but, if they were similar in result, the aggregate Congressional majority of the Whig popular vote could not have exceeded 70,000; and thus, when seventeen Whig members, representing 170,000 voters, refuse to support a national bank, it proves that darling Whig measure to be 100,000 votes in a minority; and this the President, in vetoing that measure, has acted in accordance with the will of a majority of the people almost as large as that which elected Gen. Harrison. And yet the President is continually denounced by Mr. Clay for defeating the will of the people by the one man power!

As for the other leading measures of the Whigs which the President vetoed, and also those which, unfortunately, he did not veto, they were all carried by such meagre majorities (of one to four votes) as to be according to the foregoing statements, the will of a minority of less than one-third of the people of the United States. The bankrupt law and the tariff—both of which passed finally by a majority of one vote—were carried contrary to the will of a majority of about half a million of voters.

The Whigs have delighted in stigmatizing the power of the President as accidental. It would be well for them if their own power were obnoxious to a reproach of only equal odium and of equal truth. But this vast accumulation of power in Congress over their popular strength must have been the result of long-continuing and systematic fraud—a combination, probably, of gerrymandering and pipelaying.

Mr. Clay said, in substance, in his Indianapolis speech, that he was a Democrat—was born and raised one, and always meant to be. He certainly will not, nor will any of his friends for him, pretend that he sustains the same political principles now that he did previous to the last war. If he was a Democrat then, he cannot be now, for principles do not change; and he said at the extra session, that he could not heat it into Mr. Woodbury's head that he was a Democrat—Free Trader.

DEMOCRATIC ANTI-TARIFF MEETING

Agreeably to previous notice, a numerous meeting of the Democracy took place at the Old State House, on Monday evening, the 14th of November.

On motion of General Henry S. Foote, the Hon. Wm. M. Gwin was called to the chair, and Gen. C. M. Price and Col. G. R. Fall appointed Secretaries.

The object of the meeting was briefly explained by the chair.

After a few remarks, Gen. Foote moved that a committee be appointed to draft resolutions expressive of the views of the meeting in relation to a protective tariff.

The chair appointed Gen. H. S. Foote, Gen. J. A. Quitman, Col. C. S. Tarpley, Col. U. Miller, and A. L. Hays, Esq., said committee.

The committee retired for the purpose of discharging the duty assigned them. During their absence, Col. J. E. Mathews was called upon to address the meeting, which he did in an able and satisfactory manner, expressing in strong and bold terms, his opposition to a tariff for protection, under all circumstances.

Gen. Foote, from the committee, reported the resolutions which follow.

Gen. Quitman, Col. V. E. Howard, Col. A. Hays and Gen. Foot, supported the resolutions with convincing arguments, and in strains of stirring eloquence, which were frequently responded to by the audience with cheers.

Resolved, That we have received with sentiments of the highest satisfaction, intelligence of signal democratic victories achieved in almost every quarter of the Union, and take pride in announcing our undoubling conviction, that the season of political delusion, which has lately marked our annals so discredibly, is well nigh at an end—that federalism will ere long be constrained again to hide its gorgon head from the view of patriotic freemen, as in 1831, under the star of the illustrious Jefferson, whose time-honored principles are evidently about to reign as of yore, in the hearts, and understandings, and public actions of this great people.

Resolved, That it is with pleasure difficult to state in language, that we behold the signs of unbroken concord and fraternal kindness everywhere prevalent in the Democratic ranks, a state of things which we hail as a splendid evidence of our thorough devotion to great principles as a party and as a sure precursor of our complete success in 1844.

Resolved, That among the various distinguished members of the democratic party who have been spoken of in the public prints and in popular meetings for the first and second offices of the Republic, we do not deem it expedient to announce the choice of this assemblage, preferring to invoke, as we do hereby, our fellow citizens in the different counties of the State, to confer with each other freely, dispassionately, and without prejudice, in their primary capacity, that they may be able to depute delegates to a Democratic State Convention, prepared and authorized to announce their views and wishes upon this important subject, as likewise to nominate suitable candidates for Congress, United States Senate, and various high State offices.

Resolved, That civil liberty cannot exist, where labor, industry, enterprise and capital, instead of being left to the free competition of the citizens, are controlled, regulated and directed by the government.

Resolved, That all political systems professing to protect industry and enterprise against low prices, by excluding competition, and restricting trade, and all attempts to control and direct the free use and employment of private capital by legislative enactments, are at war with the theory and spirit of our free institutions, and should be regarded as political devices to enrich one portion of the community, by plundering the other.

Resolved, That the power of laying and collecting duties upon imports was conferred upon Congress by the Constitution, for the purpose of defraying the necessary expenses of the government, and not for the purposes of protecting one branch of industry at the expense of others—and that to enact laws designed to raise the price of the productions of one class of citizens, by contributions imposed upon the wants of the rest, under pretence of raising revenue, is an abuse of the powers granted to Congress by the Constitution, a violation of its spirit and intention, and in its operation upon the country, partial, unjust and oppressive.

Resolved, That all revenue laws, or laws under guise of raising a revenue, whose object is protection, are hostile to economy, and by addressing themselves to the cupidity and private interests of individuals, promote high taxes and extravagant expenditures.

Resolved, That the late tariff law, professing to be made for revenue, but de-